Key Timestamps and Legal Violations

PLEADING TITLE - 1

27

28

Timestamp	Event	Legal Relevance
00:00:00 –	Plaintiff asks, "Am I	Initiates Fourth Amendment issue regarding
00:00:02	detained?"	unlawful detention.
00:00:03 –	Orders Plaintiff to "hang	Unlawful detention without probable cause or
00:00:05	out" and detains him.	reasonable suspicion.
00:04:31 -	Plaintiff identifies the	Misapplication of Marsy's Law in a public space
00:04:35	Marsy's Law sign.	violates First Amendment press protections.
00:05:30 -	Plaintiff confirms he is	Escalation based solely on First Amendment
00:05:32	recording.	activity—unconstitutional.
00:05:52 -	Cites NRS 171.1233,.	Misuse of investigatory stop statute, no
00:05:56		reasonable suspicion for detention.
00:06:02 -	Asserts Plaintiff is "not	Marsy's Law misapplied to suppress recording in
00:06:02.875	allowed" to record.	a public space, violating press rights.
00:09:08 –	Plaintiff argues Marsy's	Violation of press freedom under Nevada
00:09:23	Law conflicts with	Constitution—Marsy's Law cannot restrict
	Nevada's Art. 1, § 9.	recording in public.
00:09:49 –	Plaintiff cites federal case	Reference to federal precedents (e.g., Glik v.
00:09:55	law affirming public	Cunniffe, Fordyce v. Seattle) confirming
	recording rights.	recording rights in public spaces.
. }		

Legal Claims Supported

PLEADING TITLE - 2

First Amendment (42 U.S.C. § 1983): Retaliation for recording in public, unlawful 2 restriction of press rights, misapplication of Marsy's Law to prohibit First Amendment activity in a public space. Fourth Amendment (42 U.S.C. § 1983): Unlawful detainment without reasonable suspicion or probable cause, based solely on recording. Monell Liability (42 U.S.C. § 1983): Systematic suppression of press activity and violation of constitutional rights based on CCSO's signage and enforcement of an unconstitutional recording ban.

Summary Judgment Purpose (Fed. R. Civ. P. 56)

The video evidence clearly shows an unlawful detention based on First Amendment activity recording in a public space. No criminal activity was alleged, and Marsy's Law was misapplied to infringe upon press rights. This violation, coupled with the First and Fourth Amendment violations, leaves no genuine dispute of material fact, entitling Plaintiff to summary judgment.

Qualified Immunity Defeat

Defendants' actions contravene clearly established rights under Pearson v. Callahan, 555 U.S. 223 (2009). The right to record in a public space is well-established (Glik v. Cunniffe, 655 F.3d 78, 1st Cir. 2011; Fordyce v. Seattle, 55 F.3d 436, 9th Cir. 1995). Defendants' misuse of

PLEADING TITLE - 3

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Marsy's Law to suppress recording activity clearly violates these rights, making any qualified immunity defense untenable. Authentication I, Drew J. Ribar, declare under penalty of perjury (28 U.S.C. § 1746) that these timestamps accurately reflect events in a video I recorded on March 20, 2024, at the Carson City Sheriff's Office, Bates No. EX033. Dated: March 28, 2025 /s/ Drew J. Ribar Drew J. Ribar 3480 Pershing Ln, Washoe Valley, NV 89704 Tel: (775) 223-7899, Email: Const2Audit@gmail.com PLEADING TITLE - 4

Page 4 of 4